



[CONCLUDED FROM FIRST PAGE.]  
*Exposition of the Platform of the National Democracy.*

The 1st resolution emphatically declares that "the government of a Territory organized by an act of Congress is provisional and temporary," thereby rebutting the conclusions that such a Territory can frame any permanent institutions whatever, or can establish, during its territorial existence, any fundamental law whatever. It is an inchoate and imperfect government, instituted for a brief period—the creature of Congress. This resolution in connection with the third resolution, which declares that "when the settlers in a Territory, having an adequate population, form a State constitution, the right of sovereignty commences; and being consummated by admission into the Union, they stand on an equal footing with the people of other States; and the State thus organized ought to be admitted into the Federal Union, whether its constitution prohibits or recognizes the institution of slavery," is entirely consistent with the Kansas-Nebraska act. That the government of a Territory is provisional and temporary, that it is the creature of Congress, the history of the Territories conclusively establishes. Congress has always either reserved the veto power over the acts of a Territorial Legislature, or conferred it upon the Governor of the Territory, appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

But, as in the Cincinnati platform, the third resolution emphatically declares that when the people come to form their permanent institutions; when they come to lay down their fundamental law, which shall govern not only the people, but their legislative bodies and their judicial tribunals, then they are to decide for themselves whether slavery shall be an institution or not amongst them. Is the second resolution inconsistent with the first and third? It is in these words: that "it is the duty of the Federal Government, in all its departments, to protect, when necessary, the rights of persons and property in the Territories, and wherever else its constitutional authority extends." Why is government instituted at all? Is it to raise armies? Is it to raise navies? Is it to establish a postal system? Is it to collect revenue? Is it to build up a magnificent capitol, adorned with works of art and extensive and beautifully arranged grounds, and imposing edifices of granite and marble? Is it instituted to raise \$100,000,000 in order to expend it—to bring annually together, at the national capital, Senators and Representatives, and then to send them home again—to establish courts and build prisons? No; nothing of the kind. Such are not the objects of government; but they are the instruments of government. These are purely the appliances, by means of which government accomplishes its purpose. The object of government is to protect persons and property, and nothing else. Thus we see, in order to accomplish what seems to be a simple and plain purpose, resort is had to the largest and most complicated means, in order to effect it with certainty and success. Various countries have differed about their form of government; but with all these differences, the purpose has been ever the same—the protection of persons and property.

The second resolution stands inflexibly upon this proposition. Our Government has done much, from our earliest history, to protect the lives and the property of its citizens on its public domain. Where are our arms sent? To protect our Territories. For what? To protect persons and property, and nothing else. The citizens of our Territories who have been环境 by Indian foes, and have fought their way through Indian wars, realize the importance of this protection. Why was our Navy sent to Paraguay? It was on account of a citizen of one of the free States—a citizen of Rhode Island. It was a case of offense to property; and the Navy was sent there in order that our government might do its duty in protecting that property. A Government is derelict to the very purpose of its institution; it is derelict to its obligations to the individual citizen, if it fails or hesitates in acting promptly to protect the property as well as the person of that citizen.

These resolutions, taken together, do not establish slavery in the Territories, or recognize the principle of the establishment of slavery; but they declare that the rights of property of the citizens of the several States shall be protected by the Federal arm. They declare, in substance, that if a citizen of a Southern State shall go to our common Territories with his slaves, his property in those slaves shall be protected. They declare, in substance, that this provisional and temporary government of a Territory shall not molest or interfere with the right of a Southern man to hold his slaves as property in the Territory. They declare, in substance, that if the Territorial Legislature thus interferes, from the three resolutions, that the old policy, that Congress can neither establish nor prohibit slavery, has been departed from in the slightest degree. It is purely a question of property; it is purely a question of the protection of the rights of Southern men equally with the rights of Northern men. It is not a concession of the North; they yield none of their rights. It is simply an act of equal justice upon the part of the North; it is a demand of right upon the part of the South.

*Breckinridge and Lane falsely charged with Disunion Sentiments.*

The effort is made to charge disunion sentiments upon Breckinridge and Lane, because some individuals now supporting them have at some period of their lives given utterance to extreme sentiments. See with what weight and point the charge goes home to the Front Street Theatre candidates, Douglas and Johnson. One of their staunchest and most eloquent advocates on the floor of the convention, was Colonel Gaulen, of Georgia, who at the Charleston sitting advocated the re-opening of the African slave trade. We quote from the official report:

"Col. Gaulden said he would do all he could to reconcile his friends in Georgia to this doctrine, and to induce congressional protection as an abstracted. In the course of his remarks he referred to Virginia as 'slave-trading and slave-breeding Virginia.'

"A delegate from Virginia objected to the designation applied to that State.

"Mr. Gaulden.—Well, I'll say slave-trading Georgia, then—I don't object to the designation—I am a slave-breeder—I face the music. Come along to my plantation and I'll show you a fine lot of young niggers there, and pure Africans, too."

"Col. Gaulden then proceeded to advocate the revival of the African slave trade, and he,

never Massachusetts herself would shortly be won to it. He did not see why he should pay \$2,000 for a negro from Virginia when he could buy him in Africa for \$50. He denounced the trade for the suppression of the African slave trade, which, he said, was against the laws of God and nature's God. The doctrine of non-intervention should be applied to that trade—it was inhuman to send back to Africa the negroes at Key West, half of whom would die and the balance be delivered over to cannibalism."

*Sentiments of H. V. Johnson.*

But in controversy we should go to the heart of the matter. How will Mr. Johnson ring this charge to advance his prospects for the Vice Presidency? He was a Senator in Congress in 1848, and on the 7th of July of that year he made a speech to prove that Congress had the power and ought to intervene to protect slave property in the Territories. (See Appendix to Congressional Globe, 1st sess., 30th Congress, page 891.) Our space forbids extended extracts. He said:

"No event can be more salutary to the slaves of the South than the admission of each Territory with its property of every description." \*

"Since, therefore, as I have shown, Congress has no power to prohibit slavery, they cannot delegate such a power to the inhabitants of the Territory; they cannot authorize the Territorial Legislature to do that which they have no power to do. The strength cannot rise higher than its source."

The institution of slavery is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and it has the same protection, *thereabouts*, which guards our citizens against the granting of titles of nobility, or the establishment of religion; therefore, Congress would be as much bound to veto an act of Territorial legislation prohibiting it, as an act violating these rights of every citizen of the Republic."<sup>\*</sup>

To show that Mr. Johnson has not abandoned his doctrine of Congressional protection, we quote the following resolutions, drafted and then reported by him to the Convention of Georgia, held on the 4th of last June, which appointed him as a delegate to the National Convention at Baltimore:

"Resolved, That we reaffirm the Cincinnati platform, with the following additional propositions:

"1st. That the citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property of any kind, in the organized Territories of the United States, and that under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott Case, the right of personal property is not a component part of the Constitution in the strict sense, *as property stands upon the same footing as all other descriptions of property, and that neither the General Government, nor ANY TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, can destroy or impair the right to slave property in the common Territories any more than the right to any other description of property*; that property of all kinds, slaves as well as other property, is property in all the Territories, stand upon the same equal and broad constitutional basis, and subject to like principles of recognition and protection in the LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, and EXECUTIVE Departments of the Government.

"2d. That we will support any man who may be nominated by the Baltimore Convention for the Presidency, and who is in entire sympathy with the foregoing proposition, and who will give him his endorsement, and that we will not hold ourselves bound to support any man, who may be the nominee, who entertains principles inconsistent with those set forth in the above propositions, or who denies that slave property of the Territories does not stand an equal footing, and on the same constitutional basis, with all other descriptions of property, and that neither the General Government, NOR ANY TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, can destroy or impair the right to slave property in the common Territories any more than the right to any other description of property.

Mr. Douglas, in his letter to Hon. Wm. A. Richardson, read before the Convention, uses this emphatic language: "Intervention means disunion." Then, according to Mr. Douglas, *Mr. Johnson, his colleague on the ticket with him, is a disunionist.* And, according to the second resolution offered by Mr. Johnson before the Georgia Convention, he stands pledged not to support or vote for Mr. Douglas.

*Constitutional Union Party.*

But in our survey of the field we must not neglect the Constitutional union party. It is an old party, under a new guise. In 1850 they had a platform of the strictest kind, and a secret organization protected by tests and oaths. Then they waged war upon our foreign citizens and upon a certain religious creed. The same leaders now come forward repudiating platforms—announce themselves as the only Union party, and ask for votes without any declaration of their principles. Their platform is the "Constitution and the Union." The Republicans assert they are for the Constitution and the Union, yet their platform gives an interpretation to the Constitution which will destroy that Constitution and break up this Union. For which we have high authority—Mr. Fillmore, the candidate for the Presidency, in 1856, of the very men who constitute the Constitutional Union party of the present day. The Douglas Democrats avow they are for the Constitution and the Union; yet their platform, as interpreted by them, is a disunionist. And, according to the second resolution offered by Mr. Johnson before the Georgia Convention, he stands pledged not to support or vote for Mr. Douglas.

*Constitutional Union Party.*

But in our survey of the field we must not neglect the Constitutional union party. It is an old party, under a new guise. In 1850 they had a platform of the strictest kind, and a secret organization protected by tests and oaths. Then they waged war upon our foreign citizens and upon a certain religious creed. The same leaders now come forward repudiating platforms—announce themselves as the only Union party, and ask for votes without any declaration of their principles. Their platform is the "Constitution and the Union." The Republicans assert they are for the Constitution and the Union, yet their platform gives an interpretation to the Constitution which will destroy that Constitution and break up this Union. For which we have high authority—Mr. Fillmore, the candidate for the Presidency, in 1856, of the very men who constitute the Constitutional Union party of the present day. The Douglas Democrats avow they are for the Constitution and the Union; yet their platform, as interpreted by them, is a disunionist. And, according to the second resolution offered by Mr. Johnson before the Georgia Convention, he stands pledged not to support or vote for Mr. Douglas.

*True Democratic party stands on the Constitution and the Union, and their interpretation recognizes the perfect equality of the States, and maintains the integrity of the States, the necessities, and history which brought into one confederacy so many independent sovereignties. Which of these three interpretations is the interpretation of the Constitutional Union party? Or will they scorn each and all, and fall back upon their repudiated and odious platform of 1856? We feel that an intelligent people will demand at the hands of their principles. We feel that they will recognize as a true Union party the organization which stands boldly on the Constitution of their country, and proclaims the just doctrine of the equality of the States.*

*The Republican party.*

We have referred to the warnings of Mr. Fillmore against this party. The public mind has become alarmed. The mischievous effect of its doctrines has been seen in the John Brown raid, and the recent burnings and pillages in Northern Texas. Bold, unscrupulous, and vindictive leaders are at their head. They have adopted the once scorned dogma of Garrison, that slavery is a covenant with hell and an agreement with death. Sumner proclaims the barbarism of slavery. Burlingame the necessity of an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God. Seward and Lincoln the irreconcileable conflict. They, with a fanaticism rapidly getting intense as that of Peter the Hermit, are fanning the flames of sectional strife soon to break out in intestine war. They are practically leading a crusade against the South. Thanks to the mercies of the Almighty, brotherly love, the memories of a glorious history, the common sacrifices of our fathers, the unparalleled progress to empire and renown of our

people, have not lost their influence. Honest and true men all through the North have determined to crush out the monster of Northern disunion and fanaticism. A paralysis has come over the energies of the inciters of servile war. The common sense of the people revolts at the consummation of their foul designs. Good men and true are rallying from the mountains, and the plains, from city and country, from the farm, the shop, and the busy marts of trade to preserve and perpetuate the glorious heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers.

*Douglas and Republicanism.*

But where is Mr. Douglas in this struggle of good men and true, for the perpetuation of the faith of these fathers? He is allied with the Constitutional Union party of the South, and quasi allied with the Republican party at the North. He, like Seward, has proclaimed the higher law.

At Springfield he declared that the citizen of a Territory "DOES NOT DERIVE POWER FROM CONGRESS, FOR HE HAS ALREADY DERIVED IT FROM GOD ALMIGHTY." One of his principal supporters, Mr. H. L. Seymour, in his recent speech at Rochester, New York, said: "AFTER ALL THAT HAS BEEN SAID ON THE SUBJECT, THERE IS A HIGHER LAW. IT IS THAT GIVEN IN THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE. POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IS THE EXPRESSION OF THAT LAW."

*Hickman, the boldest and clearest intellect of the followers of Douglas, now upbraids him for his timidity and treachery, has manfully cast off the mask, and is now an ardent leader in the Republican ranks. His fugleman, Forney, openly advocates a coalition with the Black Republicans to defeat our candidates. We see presses, and leaders, and orators pulling down the Douglas and raising the Republican flag. We say to the Democrats of the olden time and to the young Democrats of the present day, beware of the insidious advances of the enemy. Beware of the first fatal step towards Republicanism and towards disunion. Rally to the old flag. Rally on the tried leaders. Be not snatched off into the Abolition camp with Hickman and others. We implore you to weigh these facts, and we believe you will be satisfied of the tendency of the Douglas organization towards Republicanism. Indeed the entire organization will melt, and is melting away. The freesoilists of it are now being absorbed in the Republican ranks and the true Democrats, of whom there are large numbers, are falling back into line with their old comrades, with whom they have achieved the triumphs of the Democracy.*

*Breckinridge and Douglass.*

Consider the spectacle presented to us by the Democratic and the Douglas candidates for the Presidency. Mr. Breckinridge has retired to his quiet home in Kentucky, there calmly and with dignity to await the verdict of the people. Mr. Douglas is traversing the country, especially in the north and east, dousing out the panacea of "squatter sovereignty" as a remedy for all our ills, appealing to the "higher law" and endeavoring, with the magic of his words and his presence, to cajole the people to his support. In this he will miserably fail.

In the exalted position of President of these United States, the people will exact something more than the qualities of a traveling mountebank. Mr. Douglas in his recent letter has asserted that his object was to take the question of slavery out of the halls of Congress; and yet during this whole Administration he has kept up the slavery agitation with a persistency and a fierceness amounting almost to insanity. It has caused him to neglect every other duty in Congress except the defense of his consistency, and the advocacy of his views in regard to slavery. He has been remarkable for his facility in doing votes, and when he did vote, for his votes with the Republicans. With that party not only did he vote on the Lecompton question, but on most incidental questions, in total inconsistency with his former votes. With that party he concealed, not only in his votes on such minor questions as the election of a public printer, &c., but in determining who in the Senate of the United States were the representatives of the sovereign States of Indiana. He has been a rebel, both to the organization and to the principles of the party. He has voted against its platform and its candidates.

To conciliate Republican votes, he has indulged in vulgar flings at the South.

He prefers the clams of the Rhode Island to the niggers of the South. "I HAVE MUCH MORE FONDNESS FOR YOUR CLAMS THAN I HAVE FOR THEIR NIGGERS."

These things have sunk deep into the hearts of the American Democracy; and even if he should extend his clam-baking operations to the coasts of Labrador, trying on this way the infinite relish of freshly-caught mackerel, halibut, and cod, he will find that whilst the people are pleased with the jovial qualities of the halibut, well-met fellow, they will despise and reprobate the public man.

The true Democratic party stands on the Constitution and the Union, and their interpretation recognizes the perfect equality of the States, and maintains the integrity of the States, the necessities, and history which brought into one confederacy so many independent sovereignties. Which of these three interpretations is the interpretation of the Constitutional Union party?

Or will they scorn each and all, and fall back upon their repudiated and odious platform of 1856? We feel that an intelligent people will demand at the hands of their principles.

We feel that they will recognize as a true Union party the organization which stands boldly on the Constitution of their country, and proclaims the just doctrine of the equality of the States.

*The Republican party.*

We have referred to the warnings of Mr. Fillmore against this party. The public mind has become alarmed. The mischievous effect of its doctrines has been seen in the John Brown raid, and the recent burnings and pillages in Northern Texas.

Bold, unscrupulous, and vindictive leaders are at their head. They have adopted the once scorned dogma of Garrison, that slavery is a covenant with hell and an agreement with death.

Sumner proclaims the barbarism of slavery. Burlingame the necessity of an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God.

Seward and Lincoln the irreconcileable conflict. They, with a fanaticism rapidly getting intense as that of Peter the Hermit, are fanning the flames of sectional strife soon to break out in intestine war.

They are practically leading a crusade against the South. Thanks to the mercies of the Almighty, brotherly love, the common sacrifices of our fathers, the unparalleled progress to empire and renown of our

people, have not lost their influence. Honest and true men all through the North have determined to crush out the monster of Northern disunion and fanaticism. A paralysis has come over the energies of the inciters of servile war.

The common sense of the people revolts at the consummation of their foul designs. Good men and true are rallying from the mountains, and the plains, from city and country, from the farm, the shop, and the busy marts of trade to preserve and perpetuate the glorious heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers.

*Isaac L. Stevens, Chairman.*

"THE CONSTITUTION AND THE EQUALITY OF THE STATES: THESE ARE SYMBOLS OF EVERLASTING UNION. LET THESE BE THE RALLYING SPIRITS OF THE PEOPLE!"

In behalf of the National Democratic Executive Committee.

ISAAC L. STEVENS, Chairman.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 4, 1860.

Mrs. BRECKINBRIDGE ACCEPTS AN INVITATION TO SPEAK.

The Lexington (Ky.) Standard contains the following interesting correspondence, with a few introductory remarks, which we also quote:

"The subscriber, corresponded with the attention of the whole country. It bears upon its face all the explanation necessary to the disinterested and intelligent reader. The unusual demand made by his friends, and Mr. Breckinridge's acquiescence in its propriety, may surprise those who know his repugnance to such a course. But what proper weight is given to the considerations upon which this correspondence rests, the reader cannot withhold his entire approval of the course into which Mr. Breckinridge seems to have been literally driven by the extraordinary events of the cause."

August 18, 1860.

HON. JOHN C. BRECKINBRIDGE, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Sir: Your friends of this congressional district have deplored us to request you to address the people, (at a barbecue to be given by them to suit your own convenience,) for the purpose of publicly vindicating yourself from the violent personal assaults made upon you since your nomination for the presidency at Baltimore.

"ALFRED M. SCALLES, of Rockingham, N. C.; GRANVILLE, VANCE, of Wake, 1st District; JOHN W. MOORE, of Herford.

2d. WM. B. RODMAN, of Beaufort.

3d. WM. A. ALLEN, of Duplin.

4th. A. W. VENABLE, of Granville.

5th. J. R. MCLEAN, of Guilford.

6th. J. A. FOX, of Mecklenburg.

7th. JOHN A. DICKISON, of Burke.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The following gentlemen compose this committee:

HON. I. L. STEVENS, of Oregon, Chairman.

HON. R. W. JOHNSON, of Arkansas.

HON. JEFFERSON DAVIS, of Mississippi.

HON. JESSE D. BRIGHAM, of Indiana.

HON. THOMAS B. FLORENCE, of Pennsylvania.

HON. GEO. W. HUGHES, of Maryland.

HON. JOHN W. STEVENSON, of Kentucky.

HON. A. B. MECHAM, of New Jersey.</